



C o u n t y   o f   S a n   L u i s   O b i s p o

## GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY

Janette D. Pell, Director

Helen McCann, Department Administrator

### REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL PS- #1138 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES FOR THE CYPRESS MOUNTAIN DRIVE AT KLAU CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

July 26, 2011

Revised August 2, 2011

Revised August 10, 2011

Revised August 16, 2011

Revised August 23, 2011

- 
1. *Regarding hazardous materials: Page 7 of the RFP indicates that an Initial Site Assessment for Hazardous Materials will be need but it is not mentioned in Section 4.2, Specific Requirements. Can you please clarify if an Initial Site Assessment for Hazardous Materials will be needed?*

We **will not** be asking the consultant to prepare an Initial Site Assessment for Hazardous Materials.

---

2. *Is Public Works looking for visual/photo simulations of the proposed bridge as part of the request, or just a visual or aesthetic analysis pursuant to CEQA, NEPA and the CalTrans Standard Environmental Reference (SER)?*

We do not know what level of visual analysis may be required at this point in time.

---

3. *Are there files available for review prior to the proposal deadline (or is that not allowed)?*

With the exception of the signed PES form, there are no files available for the project.

\*\*\*See posted Final Signed PES form.\*\*\*

---

4. *Who is/will be the engineer for the project or is the County handling it in-house?*

The design will be performed in-house. Cori Marsalek is the Project Manager/Engineer.

---

5. *We understand that the study area, including staging area(s), has yet to be defined...to complete the NES (including the delineation), BA, Section 106 Study and Permits, we will need to delineate a specific area of coverage. Is it possible for the County to define the most probable study area for purposes of developing the level of effort for each task?*

We do not have a map available at this point. In general, the road work will not extend farther than 200' on either end of the bridge. We should know more by time a consultant is chosen and a contract is negotiated.

---

6. *Please confirm that the bridge is a Category 5 structure and, as such, that it will not require further evaluation.*

Caltrans does not consider the bridge to be a historic structure.

---

7. *Should we assume that no other technical studies beyond those identified in the RFP will be required for CEQA compliance?*

Yes.

---

8. *The Caltrans letter dated February 3, 2011 indicated additional technical studies that should be prepared. Should we assume that these have been done or will be done? If so, will the Location Hydraulics Study, Floodplain Evaluation Report Summary, and ISA be provided to the selected consultant for incorporation into the environmental documents?*

Yes and yes; County staff will prepare the Location Hydraulics Study, Floodplain Evaluation Report Summary, and ISA.

---

9. *Should our CEQA scope of work include analysis for GHG and construction air quality analysis.*

No.

---